**Remarks/Arguments:**

Claims 1-22 are pending in this application.

Claims 42-48 are objected to, but are indicated to be allowable if a drawing objection of the present Office Action is overcome. Accordingly, this response shows where the assertedly missing element of Claim 42 is present in the drawings and described in the specification.

**Objection to the Drawings**

The drawings are objected to because the Office Action asserts that the "spacer" of independent Claim 42 is not present in the drawings. Respectfully, this feature is seen in Figure 18, and are described in the text at page 17 of the specification (set out in this response for the Examiner's convenience).

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claim 36 stands rejected under the above-identified statutory section as being fully anticipated by the Nichols '363 patent. This rejection is respectfully traversed in view of the following reasons. Claim 36 recites a unitary insert member for use in combination with an electrical junction box. This insert member is stated to include an axially extending cylindrical body portion with a stepped axial through bore with a larger diameter portion opening outwardly on said boss member and a smaller diameter portion and body portion opening on through said body portion. This stepped through bore is stated to define a shoulder on the bore disposed toward the larger diameter portion so as to provide a socket for receiving an end portion of an electrical conduit.

Now in contrast, the Nichols '363 patent is believed to disclose a junction box supplied with a strain relief or clamping device for receiving and clamping onto electrical conductor or cable (not onto electrical conduit). Particularly, Nichols states that the clamping device 16 a threaded stem 14 with a number of flared projections 18, 20. 22, 24, with threads 26. The projections define gaps 28, and a ring nut 30 is threadably received on the projections so that the projections can be clamped on a conductor.

Respectfully, the Nichols '363 device does not teach the subject matter recited by Claim 36. That is, there is no insert member taught by Nichols '363 with a stepped through bore defining a conduit socket for receiving an electrical conduit. The Nichols '363 device is simply

a wire clamp or strain relief intended and designed to clamp directly on electrical conductor inserted therein. There is no way the Nichols '363 device could receive a conduit, which is much larger than the wires which go inside such a conduit.

Accordingly, Claim 36 is respectfully submitted to present novel subject matter over the cited Nichols '363 patent.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-3, 9-12, 15-17, 19-22, and 25 stand rejected under the above-identified statutory section as obvious over the Palmer '633 patent. This rejection is respectfully traversed in view of the following reasons. The Palmer '633 patent is believed to disclose a molded plastic junction box especially designed and configured for flush wall mounting. That is, the Palmer junction box is mounted in an exposed position on the surface of a building wall. More importantly, the Palmer junction box has a smooth unbroken outside surface (Palmer Col 2, lines 36, 37). The walls of the Palmer junction box are made to include a recess or chamber 16 at which the wall can be broken out to form an opening for electrical wiring to pass into and out of the junction box. Further, Palmer '633 shows a mounting lug 20 extending from the open side of the junction box to and joining with the back wall of the junction box. In fact, the back wall 11 defines an opening 20' which extends as a passage inwardly of the junction box inside of the mounting lug 20 (viewing Figures 1, 2, 6, and 8 of Palmer '633).

In contrast, claim 1 recites:

> A high-volume, high-utility, non-conductive enclosure for electrical components and wiring comprising, a molded polymer junction box including a non-perforate back wall,, and plural non-perforate contiguous walls extending generally perpendicularly to said back wall, and each one of said plural contiguous walls joining integrally to the back wall and also to adjacent ones of said plural contiguous walls, said back wall and said plural contiguous walls cooperatively defining a chamber within said junction box, with said plural contiguous walls at respective end edges cooperatively forming an opening to said chamber, at least one of said plural contiguous walls carrying an integral mounting lug member extending across said opening, and said mounting lug member also extending inwardly of said chamber from substantially said end edge of said at least one wall toward but short of said back wall to define a termination surface, whereby an electrical component may be inserted via said opening into said chamber to be secured within the junction box at said mounting lug.

Clearly the mounting lug 20 of Palmer '633 does not extend toward but short of the back wall 11 of Palmer. The mounting lug of Palmer '633 does not define a termination surface. Instead, Palmer '633 shows a mounting lug which extends to and joins with the back wall 11 of the junction box disclosed by Palmer.

Accordingly, Claim 1 is respectfully submitted to present novel and patentably unobvious subject matter over the cited Palmer '633 patent.

Concerning Claim 2 the Office Action states that the one wall extends from the termination surface of the mounting lug to the back wall of the junction box to provide a wall portion for receiving a conduit socket. However, this cannot be correct because the mounting lug 20 of Palmer '633 does not define a termination surface. Further, there is no part of the end wall of the Palmer '633 junction box between a termination surface of the mounting lug and the back wall of the junction box that can receive a conduit socket. Palmer '633 provides all of the concealed knockouts on the end walls of the junction box spaced on either side of the mounting lug. That is, the mounting lug 20 of Palmer '633 is not truncated as taught by the present application in order to provide a termination surface and to provide increased volume within the junction box, while also providing additional wall space to which a conduit socket can be secured, as is recited by Claim2.

Thus, Claim 2 also is respectfully submitted to present novel and patentably unobvious subject matter over the cited Palmer '633 patent.

Concerning Claim 3, the Office Action states that Palmer '633 shows a drilling indicia. This simply cannot be correct because Palmer '633 clearly states that the outside wall of his junction box are smooth and unbroken (citation set out above).

Concerning Claims 10-12 the Office Action states that it would have been obvious to provide any number of mounting lugs. However, Claims 10-12 depend (directly or indirectly) from Claim 1, and are submitted to be allowable on the same basis as Claim 1.

Concerning Claim15, the Office Action states that Palmer '633 shows a mounting lug extending from the open face of the junction box toward but short of the back wall so that the wall of the junction box extending from the mounting lug to the back wall is unobstructed and available to mount conduit sockets. This simply is not true. Palmer '633 shows a mounting lug 20 extending from substantially the plane of the open face of the junction box all the way to and joining with the back wall of the junction box. There is no truncation of the mounting lug in Palmer '633, and there is no increase in volume of the junction box because of such a truncation of the mounting lug.

Further, there is no increased area of a wall of the junction box of Palmer '633 where conduit sockets can be mounted, all in contrast to the teaching of the present application.

Claims 16, 17, and 19-22 depend from independent Claim 15, and are submitted to be allowable on the same basis as the independent Claim from which they depend.

The present Office Action rejects Claims 37 and 38 over the Nichols '363 patent. Claims 37 and 38 depend from independent Claim 36, and are submitted to be allowable on the same basis as the independent Claim from which they depend.

Claims 40 and 41 are rejected over the Wentworth '581 patent. This rejection is respectfully traversed in view of the following reasons. The Wentworth '581 patent is believed to teach a tubular nipple member for connecting adjacent junction boxes, and by so connecting the adjacent junction boxes also providing a passage through the nipple member communicating the interiors of the connected junction boxes. The nipple member of Wentworth includes end termination portions which are threaded in order to capture an wall of the connected junction box between a collar on the nipple member and a nut carried on the thread of the nipple member.

In contrast, Claim 40 recites:

> An insert member for use in combination with a pair of electrical junction boxes each of which defines a respective one of a pair of outwardly opening insert recesses each of rectangular shape in axial view of said pair of insert recesses, said insert member providing for joining of said pair of electrical junction box to form a ganged pair of junction boxes, said insert member including a central body portion and a pair of rectangular boss members matching in size and shape with said pair of recesses and extending in opposite directions from said body portion, said body portion and said pair of boss members cooperatively defining a rectangular through passage opening outwardly on each of said pair of boss members and extending axially in said boss members, and body portion through said insert member, whereby each one of said pair of boss members is received into a respective insert recess of said pair of junction boxes to form a ganged pair of junction boxes and said rectangular through passage provides for passage of electrical wires between said ganged pair of junction boxes.

Now the nipple member of Wentworth '581 does not provide a rectangular through passage, nor does it provide a pair of rectangular boss members matching in size and shape to a pair of insert recesses defined by a pair of junction boxes to be ganged. That is, there is no teaching or suggestion in the cited art, and not in the Wentworth teaching particularly, of how two junction boxes with rectangular insert recesses could be ganged. The teaching of Wentworth is to gang conventional

junction boxes having conventional conduit knockouts. These conventional junction boxes could be ganged using a short piece of conduit and a pair of conduit couplings. And that structure is essentially what Wentworth '581 provides, although Wentworth provides this ganging structure in a one-piece component.

Now, further in contrast, Claim 40 recites an "insert member" for joining with a pair of junction boxes each having an insert recess of rectangular shape. The junction boxes of Wentworth '581do not have insert recesses of rectangular shape for receiving an insert member providing a conduit socket, as is the case with the junction box taught in this present application. So, there is a fundamental difference between the conventional junction boxes which Wentworth and the subject matter of the present invention. Accordingly, Claim 40 is respectfully submitted to present novel and patentably unobvious subject matter over the teaching of the Wentworth '581 patent.

Claim 41 depends from Claim 40 and is submitted to be allowable on the same basis as the claim from which it depends.

Finally, Claims 42-45 are indicated to be allowable but for the asserted drawing objection, concerning the asserted absence of a "spacer" from the drawing Figures. Set out immediately below is an excerpt from page 17 of the specification of this application, in which it is pointed out that the tabs 94 seen earlier in the application are used as spacers for the conduit connector:

> the present invention provides a conduit coupling 114, which defines a pair of oppositely extending conduit sockets 116 (only one of which is seen, in Figure 17). These conduit sockets provide for adhesively receiving an end portion of a run of conduit. However, this novel coupling has a boss 118 on one side, providing a mounting surface 120 extending parallel to the axis of the coupling. The coupling 114 also provides on boss 118 a pair of parallel mounting pins 122. These mounting pins 122 each define one or more "clipping necks" 124 (two such necks in the illustrated embodiment), at which the length of the pins may be conveniently shortened by use of a pair of scissors or cutters (i.e., common diagonal cutters, for example).
>
> Importantly, the mounting pins 122 are spaced apart by a distance agreeing with the spacing between holes 94a and 96 of the tab members 94, seen in Figures 8 and 11. As Figure 18 illustrates, a pair of tab members 94 may be received over the pins 122 and may rest upon the surface 120 of boss 118 **to serve as <u>spacers</u> spacing the coupling 114 away from the support structure to which the conduit clamp 110 is secured.** Accordingly to the illustrated embodiment, the pins 122 are long enough to accept three of the mounting tabs 94 as spacers, although the invention is not so limited. (emphasis added)

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the dual-function tabs 94 are in fact also "spacers" within the meaning of Claims 42-45. Accordingly, the Applicant submits that Claims 42-45 are allowable, and requests that the objection to these Claims be withdrawn.

In view of this amendment, both reconsideration and allowance of the Claims pending in this application are respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number set out below if such will further or expedite prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Tuesday, February 22, 2005 By Terry L. Miller

Terry L. Miller
Reg. No. 29,568
Attorney for Applicant

Law Offices of Terry L. Miller & Associates
24832 Via San Fernando
Mission Viejo, Ca 92692
(949) 951-8456 (voice and facsimile)
e-mail: TLMpatents@AOL.com